General Education Committee Meeting  
April 21, 2017

Attendees: Lindsay Barnett, Lisa Covert, Renling Jin, Shawn Morrison (Chair), Gia Quesada, Nathaniel Walker; Ex-officio: Lynne Ford

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion Points</th>
<th>Decision/Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Call to order</td>
<td>Shawn Morrison called the meeting to order at 1:02 PM.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approval of minutes</td>
<td>Committee approved minutes.</td>
<td>Committee approved minutes from the previous meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Student appeal</td>
<td>Gia Quesada explained the situation and the background of the student appeal. Committee members asked questions and determined to allow the student to transfer the second course from her previous institution in as a General Education course. The course that she transferred in would have been given the status of 1GG as it always has been, but it was given the status of 1EE this year. However, the student's catalogue year is Fall 14, when the 1GG did exist. Due to our rules of students being under the terms of their catalogue year, it is appropriate to give the course a 1GG rating; it will count as General Education math. The committee also discussed its role in this type of appeal and confirmed that we only verify the process of the appeal, we don't examine the individual pieces of the appeal, as those are evaluated by the General Education Coordinator, the Registrar, and the departments involved.</td>
<td>The committee approved the student's request to use the second transfer course as her second General Education Math course. The minutes from this meeting will be on file for future reference if needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Completion of the Foreign Language Alternative Assessment System</td>
<td>The committee voted to move forward with this program as a pilot for the next three years. The committee provided the correct tool, the Intercultural Attitudes, Skills, and Knowledge Short Scale Plus (A.S.K.S.2+), adapted from the AAC&amp;U Value Rubric. (AACU.org) The committee examined the tool and decided to use it for the pre and post tests for this assessment, as previously determined by last year's Gen Ed committee. The committee voted to approve the following: 1. We will use questions 1 - 11 of the survey as they are and add a few open-ended questions at the end of the survey. 2. There will be different questions added at the end for the pre and post. 3. We will start the assessment as a pilot, to be run for three years and then reviewed and revised as needed. The first group to take the pre test will be incoming students to the program in Fall 2017. 4. Gia Quesada will work with IT to put the pre and post on Oaks. 5. Students will take the pre test on Oaks as soon as they receive accommodation permission. 6. Gia will run reports to make sure students take the pre test before they start the courses. 7. Students will take the post test when they conclude the final course in the program. 8. Gia will remind students that they must take the test in order to graduate. 9. The Registrar's office will put a check on students' degree audit when the test has been completed. 10. Gia will keep track of the student responses for assessment purposes. The additional questions for the pre test are: 12. What role does language play in the construction of culture? 13. Have you travelled abroad? If yes, please describe. 14. Have you studied abroad? If yes, please describe. The additional questions to the post test are: 12. What role does language play in the construction of culture? 13. Did you study abroad while you were here at the College of Charleston? If yes, please describe.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Good of the order</td>
<td>The committee discussed plans and projects for next year's committee. It was agreed that they would discuss and suggest to the senate different cycles for assessing and for re-certification for courses. It was agreed that a report will be made on the frequency with which courses are taught in a three-year period.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. New committee</td>
<td>Two new committee members came to the meeting at 1:45. They were Susan Divine and Mary Beth Heston. The two new members and the two returning members present voted for the new chair for 17-18. The new chair will be Lisa Covert. The committee voted that Lisa Covert will be the chair next year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Adjournment</td>
<td>The meeting was adjourned at 1:55 PM.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Education Committee Meeting  
March 17, 2017

**Attendees:** Kristen Ashworth, Lindsay Barnett, Lisa Covert, Lynne Ford, Renling Jin, Shawn Morrison (Chair), Gia Quesada, Nathaniel Walker  
Recorded by Kristen Ashworth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion Points</th>
<th>Decision/Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Call to order</td>
<td>Shawn Morrison called the meeting to order at 1:02 PM.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approval of minutes</td>
<td>Committee approved minutes.</td>
<td>Committee approved minutes from the previous meeting.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Modeled after Foreign Language Alternative Program  
- SLOs are specific to MLAP but are related to Math SLOs (process and abstraction)  
- Our committee needs to handle the course review process  
- Assessment will be post-test only, but assessments do not have to be approved by the Faculty Senate  
Committee members asked questions about the assessment process. Points of confusion were clarified.  
For Faculty Senate, we will want to cut document after “Re-certification process.”  
Edits to the document:  
- Remove inclusion of elective math transfer credits  
- “Possible courses” needs to be a narrative rather than a list  
- Both MATH and PHIL departments have approved this plan  
- If students have taken one math course already, they will need only one alternative course  
Possible deadlines for course approval submissions next year: Oct. 31 and Jan. 31 | We will speak with Jason Howell about limiting the number of potential courses listed on the proposal.  
Lynne will add edits to document, which will be sent to committee for review.  
Committee approved Math Proposal pending edits. |
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **4. Next meeting:** April 21 | Topics for next meeting:  
- Foreign Language Alternative assessment | Shawn will send documents from last year's discussion of FLA Assessment to committee members in preparation for the meeting. Shawn will invite the four new committee members (next year’s committee) to April 21 meeting to select the chair for next year. |
| **5. Adjournment** | The meeting was adjourned at 1:44 PM. |   |
## General Education Committee Meeting
**February 24, 2017**

**Attendees:** Kristen Ashworth, Lindsay Barnett, Lisa Covert, Renling Jin, Shawn Morrison (Chair), Gia Quesada  
**Guests:** Myra Seaman, Susan Ferrell, Joe Kelly, Liz Martinez, Edward Hart, Michael O’Brien  
Recorded by Kristen Ashworth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion Points</th>
<th>Decision/Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Call to order</td>
<td>Shawn Morrison called the meeting to order at 1:01 PM.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approval of minutes</td>
<td>Friendly amendment: Lindsay Barnett and Kristen Ashworth need to be added to the Attendees list for past two meetings.</td>
<td>Committee approved minutes from the previous meeting with the friendly amendment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Resubmission of IIAS courses | **IIAS 201:** No questions from committee  
**IIAS 304:**  
- The same name shows for this course and IIAS 201 on the internal form. | Committee approved the following courses:  
IIAS 201  
IIAS 304 |
| 4. Music courses | **SPOL 150:**  
- Syllabus includes SLOs but no statement about the course specific to it covering Humanities  
- Grade breakdown needs to include specific signature assignment (rather than “papers”)  
**MUSC 280:**  
- There are two assignments, one for each SLO. One signature assignment should cover both SLOs. Critical Listening Essay seems to cover both, so a small change can correct the error. | Committee approved the following courses:  
SPOL 150  
MUSC 280 |
| 5. English revisions | **ENGL 304:** No questions from committee  
**ENGL 313:**  
- The signature assignment title needs to appear by that item in the grade breakdown (final research paper).  
**ENGL 319, 320, 327, 335, 339, 340, 344, 370:**  
- The changes are not showing on submitted version.  
- The English Dept. will revise and resubmit.  
**ENGL 343:** No questions from committee  
**ENGL 356, 364, 371:**  
- The signature assignment needs to be consistent in the grade breakdown in the syllabus.  
**ENGL 360:**  
- The signature assignment language states that the sources MAY be primary sources.  
- English Dept. addressed this concern to committee’s approval. | Committee approved the following courses:  
ENGL 304  
ENGL 313  
ENGL 319  
ENGL 320  
ENGL 327  
ENGL 335  
ENGL 339  
ENGL 340  
ENGL 344  
ENGL 370  
ENGL 343  
ENGL 346  
ENGL 347  
ENGL 349  
ENGL 351  
ENGL 352  
ENGL 353  
ENGL 356  
ENGL 357  
ENGL 358  
ENGL 359  
ENGL 360  
ENGL 361  
ENGL 362  
ENGL 363  
ENGL 364  
ENGL 365  
ENGL 366  
ENGL 367  
ENGL 368  
ENGL 369  
ENGL 370  
ENGL 371  
ENGL 375  
ENGL 376  
ENGL 377  
ENGL 378  
ENGL 379  
ENGL 380  
ENGL 381  
ENGL 382  
ENGL 383  
ENGL 384  
ENGL 385  
ENGL 386  
ENGL 387  
ENGL 388  
ENGL 389  
ENGL 390 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion Points</th>
<th>Decision/Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6. Linguistics      | LING 260: No questions from the committee  
- A concern was raised about the prerequisites, but this was clarified.  
- The committee had no further questions. | Committee approved the following courses:  
LING 260  
LING 290                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| courses             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 7. Geography        | GEOG 219:  
- A concern was raised related to the small percentage that the assignment counts. This is not something that we’ve listed as a requirement, so we’ll have to accept it.  
- The signature assignment refers to a “space” but does not explain what the space is or what type of space. Discussion led to agreement of committee that assignment is okay.  
GEOG 290:  
- The signature assignment states that the student has to use “scholarly sources” – Are these primary or secondary? These assignments were clarified. | Committee approved the following courses:  
GEOG 219  
GEOG 290                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| courses             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 8. Philosophy       | PHIL 210:  
- One of the options for Paper 3 includes using an ontology of intellectual property.  
PHIL 282: No questions from committee | Committee approved the following courses:  
PHIL 210  
PHIL 282                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| courses             |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| 9. Removal of       | No discussion                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | Committee approved the following change:  
Removal of LING 125 as a Foreign Language Alternative                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                           |
| LING 125 as a       |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Foreign Language    | Alternative                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
| Alternative         |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                      |
**General Education Committee Meeting**  
**February 10, 2017**

**Attendees:** Kristen Ashworth, Lindsay Barnett, Lisa Covert, Renling Jin, Shawn Morrison (Chair), Gia Quesada, Nathaniel Walker  
**Guests:** English Department faculty representatives, Myra Seaman and Susan Farrell  
Recorded by Kristen Ashworth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion Points</th>
<th>Decision/Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Call to order</td>
<td>Shawn Morrison called the meeting to order at 1:00 PM.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approval of minutes</td>
<td>Correction: Irina Erman’s name was misspelled in item 5.</td>
<td>Committee approved minutes from the previous meeting (1/27/2017) with the friendly amendment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Discuss and vote on English Humanities proposals | ENGL 304  
- The committee raised a question about the syllabus and signature assessment (research analysis).  
- Dept. will adjust wording under General Education SLOs to match what's in the grade break-down.  
| ENGL 306 – No questions/comments |
| | ENGL 313  
- The committee raised two concerns: (1) about the signature assignment, which seemed to be a report rather than an analysis, and (2) about terminology between signature assignment and grade break-down in syllabus.  
- English Dept. explained that a newspaper is considered as a primary source for the assignment and will make the correction in terminology in the syllabus.  
| ENGL 314 – No questions/comments |
| | ENGL 315  
- The committee raised a concern raised about whether the signature assignment meets requirements.  
- English Dept. will clarify wording and integrate it earlier in the syllabus.  
| ENGL 317 – No questions/comments |
| | ENGL 318 – No questions/comments |

(Continued on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion Points</th>
<th>Decision/Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Continued from previous page | ENGL 319  
- The committee raised two concerns: (1) about the signature assignment, which does not seem like an analysis of a primary source and (2) about which part of the exam will be used as the signature assignment.  
- English Dept. will need to correct this proposal and resubmit it to the committee. | Motion to request changes and resubmission for the following Round 1 English courses that currently do not meet General Education requirements, followed by second: ENGL 319, ENGL 327, ENGL 335, ENGL 339, ENGL 340. Motion passed unanimously. |
| ENGL 320 | Gia raised a concern about the trend moving towards the signature assignment being part of the final exam for grading purposes, which doesn’t provide enough time for grading.  
- English Dept. will address this concern and possibly pull it from final exam to be collected earlier in the semester. | The English Department will review Round 2 courses and make revisions based on today’s feedback. |
| ENGL 321 | The committee raised a concern about the signature assignment (essay vs. paper).  
- English Dept. will adjust the wording for consistency. |  |
| ENGL 323 | The committee raised a concern about the signature assignment: Students do not have to use a literary text.  
- The committee determined that this is not a concern after hearing the explanation from the English Dept. |  |
| ENGL 325 | The committee raised two concerns: (1) “General Education” and “Humanities” needs to be included above SLOs in syllabus, (2) inconsistency in terminology for signature assignment (e.g., term paper vs. final paper).  
- English Dept. will adjust wording to address both concerns. |  |
| ENGL 326 | The committee raised a concern about terminology related to the signature assignment in the syllabus and grade breakdown.  
- English Dept. will adjust wording for consistency. |  |
| ENGL 327 | The committee raised a concern about the signature assignment: The word “discuss” is used and should be “analyze” or “interpret.”  
- This will need to be corrected and resubmitted. |  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion Points</th>
<th>Decision/Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Continued from previous page | ENGL 328  
- The committee raised a concern about the syllabus: Add “General Education” and “Humanities” above SLOs.  
- English Dept. will make correction.  
ENGL 335  
- The committee raised three concerns: (1) about the syllabus: Add “General Education” and “Humanities” above SLOs; (2) the signature assignment can be a group project; (3) students are not required to analyze a primary source (based on options in the assignment).  
- This will need to be changed and resubmitted.  
ENGL 336 – No questions/comments  
ENGL 337  
- The committee raised a concern about using the first of several essays as the signature assignment – Does this allow time for mastery?  
- Determined this was not an issue.  
ENGL 339  
- The committee raised three concerns: (1) signature assignment does not specifically state that primary sources are used (unclear language); (2) related to the number of pre-requisites and how specialized the course is; (3) the signature assignment is not listed in the grade break-down  
- English Dept. explained that the signature assignment is “travel writing.”  
- This will need to be changed and resubmitted.  
ENGL 340  
- The committee raised a concern that General Education SLOs are not on the syllabus.  
- This will need to be corrected and resubmitted.  
ENGL 341  
- The committee raised two concerns: (1) related to the course number on the cover page not matching and (2) SLOs are listed twice.  
- These mistakes will be corrected.  
ENGL 342  
- The committee raised concerns related to the name of the signature assignment (would be helpful to use the term “final research paper”).  
- This will be corrected. | See above |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion Points</th>
<th>Decision/Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continued from previous page</td>
<td>Gia asked the English representatives about managing the grading for General Education assessment related to these courses. When there are more courses, who will be responsible for making sure that the courses stay on track for General Education (closing the loop)? The English representatives stated that the department has an Assessment Committee. Gia requested contact information from that committee.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Shawn shared some feedback on ENGL 344 (in Round 2 of English proposals): issue related to the signature assessment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Agenda items we did not get to during this meeting</td>
<td>Discuss math alternative proposal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Adjournment</td>
<td>The meeting was adjourned at 1:50, so that committee members could attend the SACSCOC mock interview training.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## General Education Committee Meeting
### January 27, 2017

**Attendees:** Lisa Covert, Renling Jin, Shawn Morrison (Chair), Gia Quesada, Nathaniel Walker; Lynne Ford  
**Guests:** Jonathan Neufeld (Philosophy), Bryan Ganaway (Honors), Liz Martinez (Linguistics), Joe Kelly (Irish and Irish American Studies), Irina Erman (Russian Studies)  
Recorded by Kristen Ashworth

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Discussion Points</th>
<th>Decision/Action Needed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Call to order</td>
<td>The meeting was called to order at 1:00 PM.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Approval of minutes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Committee approved minutes from the previous meeting (12/2/2016).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3. Review of Philosophy proposals | PHIL 210:  
- Committee asked a question about the assignments (i.e., two essays instead of one signature assignment).  
- Jonathan Neufeld stated that the second essay can serve as the single assignment.  
PHIL 298: Committee had no questions  
PHIL 282:  
- Committee asked about the wording in the form and syllabus (e.g., essay vs. paper) and whether students have to reference the text (if not, the assignment would not be gradable).  
- Jonathan Neufeld stated that essay and paper are the same thing and that he would adjust the wording. He also stated that the requirement for the reference will be made clear to students.  | Jonathan Neufeld will edit the forms and syllabi for PHIL 210 and PHIL 282 and resubmit them. |
| 4. Review of Honors proposals | HONS 381: Committee had no questions  
HONS 382:  
- Committee asked about the theory being used for the key assessment, and Bryan Ganaway clarified to the committee’s satisfaction.  
- Committee asked about Bryan’s confidence in covering Special Topics courses. Bryan clarified that the department did a good job of explaining the General Education requirements to course instructors. | N/A |
| 5. Review of Russian Studies proposals | Irena Erman provided a brief explanation of the following two courses.  
RUST 300: Committee had no questions  
RUST 250: Committee had no questions | N/A |
| 6. Review of Irish and Irish American Studies Proposals | IIAS 304:  
- Committee raised concerns with the syllabus wording that includes Social Science, missing justification for a 300-level course, incorrect title on the form, unclear Humanities SLOs in syllabus.  
- Joe Kelly noted corrections that need to be made.  
IIAS 201:  
- Committed raised concerns that the syllabus was not clear in terms of the required SLOs and signature assignments. Additionally, syllabus listed Social Science SLOs rather than Humanities. | Joe Kelly will make the needed corrections and resubmit the forms and syllabi. |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 7. Review of Linguistics proposals | LING 290:  
- Committee raised concerns with the signature assignment and questioned which assignment would be used. Committee was also concerned with the example assignment (i.e., explaining a concept, such as vowel shifts, rather than applying a model or theory – this does not match the SLO).  
- Liz Martinez stated that a “vowel shift” is a linguistics theory, but the committee still questioned whether this was a broad enough social science theory.  
- Committee determined that the assignment, as stated, was too specific to linguistics to meet the SLO.  
LING 260:  
- Committee raised concerns about the signature assignment relating more to Humanities than Social Science. | Liz Martinez will adjust the wording of the signature assignment for LING 260 and resubmit it. |
| 8. Review of Foreign Language proposals | FREN 250, LATN 250, and PORT 250  
- Shawn Morrison explained that 250 language courses are the combination of 201 and 202. They have the same SLOs and signature assignments.  
- Committee had no questions. |  |
<p>| 8. Foreign language alternative appeal case | Gia Quesada approved the appeal because the student was under the old program. Shawn raised the point that, since we no longer have a General Education freeze, that we will no longer have a foreign language alternatives freeze. | Appeal approved prior to meeting. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. Other issues related to General Education courses</th>
<th>Gia raised the point that removing the freeze adds concern about Special Topics courses, because they will be difficult to trace as they potentially change over time. We should check on the total number of Special Topics courses. Lynne Ford reminded the committee that they can put forward a proposal to remove all Special Topics courses from General Education. Gia also raised concerns about keeping up with all General Education courses as more are added. Should departments with more classes have to provide more graders? Should we begin a larger conversation related to General Education? We could write a white paper to provide to next year’s committee. Moving forward, since the Senate voted against the freeze, we will need to set up a cycle for reviewing courses.</th>
<th>Committee will find Special Topics courses that have counted as General Education for the past two years, pull the syllabi and signature assignments, and review them to make sure they remain in compliance with General Education requirements. The committee will share these data with the Senate to begin the conversation about the purpose of General Education.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. Official vote on course proposals</td>
<td>Committee voted unanimously in favor of the following General Education courses: - Foreign Language: FREN 250, LATN 250, PORT 250 - Social Science: HONS 382 - Humanities: RUST 300, RUST 250, HONS 381, PHIL 298, PHIL 198 Committee requested revisions for the following courses: - Social Science: LING 260, LING 290 - Humanities: IIAS 201, IIAS 304, PHIL 210, PHIL 282</td>
<td>Approved courses: FREN 250 LATN 250 PORT 250 HONS 382 RUST 300 RUST 250 HONS 381 PHIL 298 PHIL 198 Need revisions: LING 260 LING 290 IIAS 201 IIAS 304 PHIL 210 PHIL 282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Plan for the next set of courses for review</td>
<td>The English Dept. provided their justification for 300-level courses.</td>
<td>Committee will review the first half of English courses on 2/10/2017.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
General Education Committee Meeting
December 2, 2016

Attendees: Lisa Covert, Renling Jin, Shawn Morrison (Chair), Nathaniel Walker, Lynne Ford
Recorded by Kristen Ashworth

I. Approval of minutes from the November 18, 2016 meeting
   A. Minutes approved

II. Review and vote on newly-submitted and/or resubmitted courses
   A. We received two new proposals, but they arrived too late to be considered at this
      meeting; we will review these at the January meeting. January 20 is the next and only
      remaining submission date.

III. Moving forward with the freeze removed
   A. January 20 is the deadline for proposals. We will not accept proposals beyond that
      date for consideration this school year.
   B. We will schedule two meetings per month, with the understanding that the second
      will be canceled if all items are addressed during the first meeting.
   C. Chairs will still upload proposals to OAKS, and Gia will continue to serve as the
      gatekeeper this year.
   D. We will submit all proposals to the Senate for a vote as one batch rather than sending
      them each month as we approve them. We will send them for a vote during the
      March Senate meeting.

IV. General Education Assessment process: Potential changes to consider
   A. Do we increase the number of artifacts that are assessed in order to keep the
      percentage of the sample the same, or do we keep the same number of artifacts
      assessed, thus decreasing the percentage of our sample?
      1. The committee agreed that we will proceed this year with the same cycle.
      2. More courses taught means more artifacts collected. Currently, we sample
         from those artifacts for assessment. Lynn stated that the sample size could
         remain the same (i.e., decrease the percentage of artifacts in the sample).
      3. Lynn also presented options: With seven distribution areas, we could sample
         from two or three distribution areas during each cycle (determined by
         assessment plan).
   B. Do we begin identifying courses and/or specific professors who have not given good
      assessments? If so, how, what are the consequences, when do we begin identifying
      them, etc.? We’ve received reports from ARGs about signature assignments that do
      not meet the rubric. The number of inappropriate assignments is significant.
      Discussion points follow.
      1. Our committee’s charge shouldn’t be going after certain faculty.
      2. In the future, we could have faculty submit three cycles of signature
         assignments to the committee so that we can determine whether the course
         remains in Gen Ed.
3. Communicate why certain assignments are unrateable. Could even have faculty attempt to grade the assignments themselves when the ARGs determine they are unrateable?

4. Gia has the record of “unrateable assignments.” One potential solution could be to have Gia contact the Chair of the department when a signature assignment doesn’t meet the rubric. It then becomes the Chair’s job to address it with the faculty member.

5. Another solution is a three strikes policy: With the second time that the assignment is not ratable, a warning is sent saying that the course is in danger of being removed from General Education.

6. Another solution is to provide faculty development workshops on creating and assigning appropriate signature assignments.

7. Faculty members frame the problem as an academic freedom issue. Many of the signature assignments that don’t fit the rubric are actually better assignments than what would fit the rubric. The problems seem to come from multiple levels (e.g., management, faculty, course being taught by different faculty).

8. The overall problem is that there’s no consensus of what General Education should be. We could create a report of the problems with General Education for faculty (presented to Senate) to begin a discussion and begin moving toward an agreement/solution. This will also help with transparency.

9. We must also consider other policies, such as 300- and 400-level justification, how long departments must wait to resubmit a course that has been removed from General Education due to inadequate signature assignments, etc.

10. At some point, the committee has to figure out how to put the courses on a review cycle to make sure that courses remain consistent.

11. If we limit the number of General Education courses within each department (at least in Humanities), it could be less stressful on the departments.

V. SACS visit
   A. The off-site report from SACS had no questions about General Education.
   B. For the on-campus visit, the committee will need to be prepared to answer questions about General Education.

VI. Math Alternatives
   A. The Math Department submitted a draft proposal. Shawn will contact them to find out when a completed proposal will be submitted.
   B. This committee can not approve the proposal until the final version is submitted to us.
General Education Committee Meeting  
November 18, 2016

Attendees: Lisa Covert, Renling Jin, Shawn Morrison (Chair), Gioconda Quesada, Nathaniel Walker; Lynne Ford; Divya Bhati, Joshua Bloodworth
Guests: Mark Del Mastro; Bryan Ganaway; Mike Maher
Recorded by Shawn Morrison

1. The committee approved the minutes from November 4, 2016.
2. Proposals
   a. LTSP 250: approved; the word Humanities was added to the syllabus
   b. LTSP 252: approved; the word Humanities was added to the syllabus
   c. HONS 281: pending, waiting for the word Humanities to be added to the syllabus
   d. HONS 382: Not approved for the following reasons:
      1. Justification for 300-level not sent -- the chair of the Gen Ed committee, Shawn Morrison, apologized for forgetting to inform Bryan Ganaway that we needed that justification.
      2. Syllabus was corrected; however, the signature assignment does not meet the General Education Social Science Rubric.
      3. The committee recommended that the Honors Committee write a justification for the 300-level courses being used for Gen Ed, and that they create a common signature assessment for all interdisciplinary Honors courses that can be used for Social Science.
      4. The committee requested that the same syllabus be resubmitted to show how that course fits the criteria and the performance descriptions for Social Science.
   e. ITST 390: approved
   f. LTIT 450: not approved. The committee recommended that the Italian Studies Program revise, rename, and renumber the course to fit with the College of Charleston's policy on course numbering. These recommendations included the following rationale:
      1. Students may not understand that a 400-level course is appropriate for the General Education requirement; they may think it is too hard.
      2. As the course is configured now, there is no way to include the content on the course in the catalogue, so students don't currently know what will be taught in it.
      3. It would be clearer that it is a General Education course for everyone if it is at the 100 level.
   g. LTFR 150: approved
   h. LTFR 250: approved
   i. HIST 241: approved
   a. The committee discussed a petition for an exception to the rule that students take two courses in the same region. The student is graduating in Spring 2017, the student has a required course in the major that meets at the same time as the
only course offered in the required geographical region this spring meets. The committee granted the exception, requesting the student to work with his/her advisor.

b. A student requested to have a Spoleto course count for humanities, even though the course is not a humanities course. The committee denied the request, due to the fact that the humanities courses are clearly listed on the Registrar's Website, as well as in the student's Degree Works Audit.

4. Divya Bhati asked the committee to save the dates of March 27 - March 30, 2017 for the on-site visit of SACS-COC. They will be meeting with the General Education committee to discuss General Education.

5. Items 4, 5, and 6 from the agenda were not discussed today; they will be on the agenda for our next meeting, December 2, 2016.

6. For the good of the order: Gia will open up the drop box on Oaks for submissions. We will remind everyone that January 20 is the deadline, as announced, for this year.

7. Adjournment, 12:05.
General Education Committee Meeting
November 4, 2016

Attendees: Kristen Ashworth, Lindsay Hall, Lisa Covert, Renling Jin, Shawn Morrison (Chair), Gioconda Quesada, Nataniel Walker, Lynne Ford
Recorded by Kristen Ashworth

1. Introduction of new committee member

2. Approval of minutes from October 21: Minutes approved

3. Discussion of Senate meeting from November 1
   a. Senate voted against the 3-year freeze period; General Education will change each year.
   b. Discussion on ways to handle proposals; some suggestions included setting due dates during the year.

4. New round added, due Jan. 20, 2017; potentially adding another round in February

5. Discussion and vote on remaining courses from round one of application process
   a. Discussion regarding whether we can determine that a course is not appropriate
   b. Lynne shared that she wants committee to read the SACSCOC General Education standards.
   c. Lynne also shared that she feels that department chairs should be invited to attend meetings where their proposals will be reviewed. Committee agrees that those who resubmit and those in the new batch should be invited.
   d. Courses:
      i. Approved in previous meeting: HIST 224, HIST 226, HIST 230
      ii. Approved today:
         
         HIST 211, HIST 212, HIST 218 (adjust Gen Ed objectives), HIST 219 (adjust Gen Ed objectives), HIST 234, HIST 235, HIST 244, HIST 247, HIST 251, HIST 261, HIST 262, HIST 272, HIST 273, HIST 276, HIST 277, HIST 301, HIST 336, HIST 341, HIST 343, HIST 344 (inconsistencies in grade breakdown and assignment), HIST 346, HIST 347, HIST 348, HIST 357, HIST 364, HIST 370, HONS 381, LATN 301 (removal from Gen Ed), MUSC 233, MUSC 234, SOST 200, FRCS 102, FRCS 101, HONS 190/192, HONS 282, LING 101
iii. NOT approved:

1. HIST 241 (signature assignment in form does not match syllabus, and what is listed on the syllabus does not qualify – not primary source)

2. HONS 281 (prompt for essay and statement regarding grade breakdown needed)

3. LTIT 450 (resubmit and justify 400 level)

4. ITST 390 (resubmit and justify 300 level)

5. HONS 382 (missing all Gen Ed information on syllabus; does this fit with Gen Ed?)

e. Suggestions for future:

i. We could provide an example syllabus that is clear for Gen Ed requirements. While this is available on Oaks, most chairs and directors are not looking at it. We may want to find another way to communicate this.

ii. In the case of courses where the assignment has not been ratable or has not met the General Education SLOs for the area for a several cycles, we could initiate some sort of consequence such as removing the course from Gen Ed for a number of years.

General Education Committee Meeting
October 21, 2016

Attendees: Kristen Ashworth, Lindsay Hall, Lisa Covert, Renling Jin, Shawn Morrison (Chair), Gioconda Quesada, Lynne Ford, Mary Bergstrom
Recorded by Kristen Ashworth

1. General Education freeze
   a. Discussion on whether we can freeze deletions only
      i. Changes in catalog year vs. year of entry
      ii. Potential problem 1: Without a freeze for adding courses, there have been too many courses in the past
      iii. Potential problem 2: Issues with confusion in advising
   b. Discussed the use of terms freeze and thaw, and decided to keep them
   c. Clarifying that courses can be added/proposed but will only be officially added during the thaw year (will not count during freeze period)
   d. Email should go to all faculty from administration, rather than go through department chairs
   e. Vote to send this motion to the Senate: 3-year freeze + 1-year thaw
      i. 6 yes, 0 no, 0 abstain
      ii. No additional discussion

2. The committee approved minutes from Sept. 9, 2016

3. The committee approved minutes from workshop on Sept. 23, 2016

4. Discussion on 300- and 400-level courses as part of General Education
   a. Feedback from SACSCOC: Including upper level courses in Gen Ed is a potential problem.
   b. If we decide to cut upper level courses from Gen Ed, how would we decertify those that are already part of the Gen Ed?
   c. Currently, proposals for these courses must include a clear rationale for why the course should be Gen Ed and not just for majors.
   d. Current plan:
      i. Continue through this cycle as we did before.
      ii. Ask Chairs who haven’t already done so to justify 300- and 400-level courses (for the record and so that they consider/reflect on the use of upper-level courses in Gen Ed)
      iii. In the future, we need to define what is appropriate for General Education (including numbering system issues).
      iv. We will wait for the College to figure out the course numbering issue before we add a Gen Ed policy related to upper-level courses.
   e. Discussion on double-dipping
      i. Currently, students must take 4 Humanities. Students majoring in Humanities can only double-dip for 2 of the courses.
ii. Discussion on the option to drop requirement to 2 Humanities with no double-dipping (future issue)

5. First round of proposals
   a. Committee reviewed/discussed proposals for HIST 211, HIST 212, HIST 218, HIST 219, HIST 224, HIST 226, HIST 230, HIST 234, HIST 235, and HIST 241
      i. Vote for approval for HIST 224, HIST 226, HIST 230 – 6 yes, 0 no
      ii. We will discuss the others at the next meeting
      iii. We found some problems with the others, which will be sent back to the History Dept. so that corrections can be made to all others.
   b. Update: SLO 2 wording changed based on SACSCOC feedback – use *area under study* instead of *discipline* (this is on the new forms)
   c. At the next meeting (Nov. 4), we’ll review all other proposals that are currently on the Gen Ed OAKS page.
   d. Invite Chairs for current list to the next meeting.
General Education Committee
Workshop for Chairs and ARGs on Submitting Course Proposals for General Education
September 23, 2016, 11:00 AM, Beatty 212

Led by Gia Quesada

Gia provided an overview of the submission process and showed the General Education Committee website (see PowerPoint for details). She also reminded the group that a Chair will need to get the Dean’s signature but only the Chair can submit the packet to OAKS.

Gia explained the freeze and provided rationale. Comments: Someone suggested being able to add courses any year (which should not cause a problem for transfer students) and only “freezing” the ability to delete courses. Gia shared the potential to use Humanities Special Topics.

Gia provided the timeline for the freeze period and reviewed the process of sampling freshmen and seniors in Humanities (suggestion from ARGs).
General Education Committee Meeting  
September 9, 2016  

Attendees: Kristen Ashworth, Lindsay Hall, Lisa Covert, Renling Jin, Shawn Morrison (Chair), Gioconda Quesada, Lynne Ford, Lynn Cherry, Karin Roof, Mary Bergstrom  
Recorded by Kristen Ashworth  

1. Welcome and introductions  

2. Committee approved minutes from last meeting (Spring 2016).  

3. Kristen Ashworth agreed to serve as this year’s minute-taker.  

4. Math alternatives: Math Dept. has a subcommittee to develop a plan for math alternatives.  

5. General Education freeze and course certification  
   
a. Lynne Ford provided an update/history of General Education at CofC  
   • We must decide to make a change or the Senate needs to affirm the system we currently have in place.  
   • Most recent changes: Signature assignments/rubrics and SLOs developed and reported on a regular basis; reduction in Gen Ed courses (certification process)  
   • The need for a certified body of coursework (assessment) led us to the freeze.  
   • This year, this committee must make decisions regarding the following:  
      o How long will the freeze last?  
      o Incoming student issues (e.g., General Education catalog is attached to admission year)  
   • Question from committee: How do we compare to other SC schools? A: Our curriculum changes more often than that of other SC schools.  

b. Discussion of freeze length  
   • Registrar’s Office is in favor of a longer freeze.  
   • Committee tends to agree with 3-year freeze.  
   • Proposal to do workshops for department chairs to share about certification process and discuss length of freeze  
   • Recommendation that we have a sense of what levels count as General Education courses to be prepared to discuss with chairs  

c. Announcement to chairs  
   • Add brand new courses  
   • Add existing courses that are not currently General Education  
   • Remove courses from General Education  
   • Must meet SLOs  
   • Assignment must be aligned to SLO rubrics  
   • Information must be on syllabus
d. Workshops
   - Include examples of successful proposals
   - Provide examples of what might cause a course to not be certified

e. Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Event Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 16</td>
<td>Announcement and protocols to department chairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 23</td>
<td>Workshop, 11:00-12:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sept. 27</td>
<td>Workshop, 3:00-4:00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 14</td>
<td>Round 1 deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct. 20</td>
<td>Agenda to Senate (request permission to send Oct. 21)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 1</td>
<td>Senate to vote on freeze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov. 11</td>
<td>Round 2 deadline (final)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. Other points
   - We do not need help from Assessment Committee.
   - We do not need to change forms.